IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BEAUMONT DIVISION

LARRY RAY TINNER §

VS. S CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:07cv831

AL HAYNES §

MEMORANDUM OPINION REGARDING TRANSFER

Petitioner Larry Ray Tinner, an inmate confined at the Houston Federal Detention Center in Houston, Texas, proceeding *pro se*, brings this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

Discussion

Petitioner submitted this petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the calculation of his sentence. Petitioner requests credit for time spent in jail in Shelby County, Texas.

Analysis

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a) provides that "[w]rits of habeas corpus may be granted by the Supreme Court, any justice thereof, the district courts and any circuit judge within their respective jurisdictions." "To entertain a § 2241 habeas petition, the district court must, upon the filing of the petition, have jurisdiction over the prisoner or his custodian." United States v. Gabor, 905 F.2d 76, 78 (5th Cir. 1990) (citation omitted). A § 2241 petition must be filed in the district where the petitioner is incarcerated. Id.; Hooker v. Sivley, 187 F.3d 680, 682 (5th Cir.1999).

Petitioner is currently confined in the Federal Detention Center in Houston, Texas where he was located when he submitted the petition. Houston is located in Harris County, Texas. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 124, Harris County is located in the Southern District of Texas. As petitioner is not incarcerated in the Eastern District of Texas, this court is without jurisdiction to consider petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus; subject-matter jurisdiction cannot be waived. See DeCell & Associates v. F.D.I.C., 36 F.3d 464, 471 (5th Cir. 1991).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it could have been brought. Such a transfer may be done *sua sponte* and is reviewable only for an abuse of discretion. *Mills v. Beech Aircraft Corp.*, 886 F.2d 758, 761 (5th Cir. 1989).

After considering the circumstances, the court has determined that the interests of justice would best be served if this petition were transferred to the district in which the petitioner is confined rather than dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction. An Order of Transfer so providing shall be entered in accordance with this Memorandum Order.

SIGNED this 15 day of November , 2007.

EARL S. HINES

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE